			1
1	UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT		
2	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK		
3		×	
4	In the Matters of:	Lead Case No.	
5	RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, et al.,	12-12020-mg	
6	Debtors.		
7		×	
8	RESCAP LIQUIDATING TRUST,		
9	Plaintiff,	Adv. Pro. No.	
10	- against -	14-01967-mg	
11	ISGN FULFILLMENT SERVICES, INC.,		
12	Defendant.		
13		·x	
14	RESCAP LIQUIDATING TRUST,		
15	Plaintiff,	Adv. Pro. No.	
16	- against -	14-01968-mg	
17	ISGN SOLUTIONS, INC.,		
18	Defendant.		
19		×	
20			
21			
22			
23			
24 25			
<i>1</i> 7			

		2	1
1			
2			1
3			1
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			1
15			1
16	United States Bankruptcy Court		1
17	One Bowling Green		
18	New York, New York		1
19	August 20, 2015		
20	10:05 AM		1
21			1
22	BEFORE:		
23	HON. MARTIN GLENN		
24	U.S. BANKRUPTCY JUDGE		
25			

3 1 2 Status Conference regarding Gosselin matter. 3 4 Status Conference RE: Objection to Claim(s) Filed by Alvin 5 and Sandra LaBostrie. 6 7 (CC: Doc# 8315, 8528, 8551) Status Conference RE: ResCap Borrower Claims Trusts Objection to Proof of Claim No. 725. 8 9 (CC: Doc# 8859, 8864) ResCap Borrower Claims Trusts Eighty-10 11 Eighth Omnibus Objection to Claims ((I) No Liability Borrower 12 Claims and (II) Reduce and Allow Borrower Claims). 13 14 Adversary proceeding: 14-01967-mg Rescap Liquidating Trust v. 15 ISGN Fulfillment Services, Inc. 16 Status Conference 17 18 Adversary proceeding: 14-01968-mg Rescap Liquidating Trust v. 19 ISGN Solutions, Inc. 20 Status Conference 21 22 23 24 25

4 1 2 APPEARANCES: MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP 3 Attorneys ResCap Liquidating Trust 4 And ResCap Borrower Claims Trust 5 6 250 West 55th Street 7 New York, NY 10019 8 9 BY: JORDAN A. WISHNEW, ESQ. 10 11 12 LAW OFFICE OF LAIRD HEAL 13 Attorney for Gosselin 14 120 Chandler Street 15 Worcester, MA 01609 16 17 BY: LAIRD J. HEAL, ESQ. (TELEPHONICALLY) 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

```
5
 1
 2
    THOMAS MARGOLIS ATTORNEY AT LAW
 3
           Attorney for William Futrell
           125 East Charles Street
 4
           Suite 214
 5
 6
           Muncie, IN 47305
 7
 8
    BY:
           THOMAS MARGOLIS, ESQ. (TELEPHONICALLY)
 9
10
11
    MOHAMMED GHODS, ESQ.
12
           Creditor, Pro Se (TELEPHONICALLY)
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
    Transcribed by: Penina Wolicki
21
    eScribers, LLC
22
     700 West 192nd Street, Suite #607
23
    New York, NY 10040
24
     (973)406-2250
25
    operations@escribers.net
```

	6
1	PROCEEDINGS
2	THE COURT: Please be seated. We're here in
3	Residential Capital, number 12-12020.
4	MR. WISHNEW: Good morning, Your Honor.
5	THE COURT: Mr. Wishnew.
6	MR. WISHNEW: Jordan Wishnew, Morrison & Foerster, for
7	the ResCap Borrower Claims Trust, and with regards to Mr.
8	Boyd's stay relief motion, the ResCap Liquidating Trust.
9	THE COURT: I'm having a little trouble hearing you.
10	MR. WISHNEW: I'm sorry, Your Honor.
11	THE COURT: Go ahead.
12	MR. WISHNEW: Jordan Wishnew, Morrison & Foerster
13	THE COURT: That part I heard.
14	MR. WISHNEW: okay, for the ResCap Borrower Claims
15	Trust, and at it concerns the stay relief motion filed by Mr.
16	Michael Boyd, the ResCap Liquidating Trust.
17	THE COURT: Okay, go ahead.
18	MR. WISHNEW: Your Honor, the first
19	THE COURT: Mr. Boyd, are you on the phone?
20	MR. WISHNEW: The first set of matters going
21	THE COURT: Hold on a second. Is Boyd on the phone?
22	No.
23	Go ahead.
24	MR. WISHNEW: Thank you, Your Honor. The first set of
25	matters going forward this morning are status conferences on

7

1 page 8 of the agenda. There are three status conferences. The 2 first one concerns the claim of Rhonda Gosselin. 3 THE COURT: Yes. I believe her counsel, Laird Heal, is on 4 MR. WISHNEW: 5 the phone. 6 THE COURT: Mr. Heal, are you on the phone? 7 MR. HEAL: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Laird 8 Heal. 9 THE COURT: Good morning. MR. WISHNEW: Your Honor, briefly. 10 The Court had 11 issued an order on April 21st sustaining in part and overruling 12 in part, without prejudice, the Borrower Claims Trust's 13 objection to claim number 3862. There was subsequently a motion for partial reconsideration which the Court also 14 15 There are, I believe, three outstanding elements of 16 Ms. Gosselin's claim that remain outstanding. 17 Unfortunately, to date, we've not been able to --18 despite our numerous requests -- get any sort of estimated damages or proposed settlement from Ms. Gosselin to try and 19 20 engage in discussions. So we've put this status conference on today's calendar in order to move forward, set a scheduling 21 22 order, and bring this to an evidentiary hearing. 23 THE COURT: Okay. Yes? 24 What we propose, Your Honor -- and this MR. WISHNEW: 25 was put into a letter that chambers received yesterday as part

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of a status letter, and it's also -- these dates have been shared with Mr. Heal, to which we've not received any response But our proposal is discovery be completed no later than October 2nd, 2015. An evidentiary hearing would be scheduled at a date convenient for the Court, approximately one month after the completion of discovery. Two weeks prior to the scheduled evidentiary hearing, the parties shall file with the Court pre-trial memoranda and findings of fact and conclusions And one week prior to the scheduled evidentiary of law. hearing, the parties would provide the Court and the opposing party with pre-marked exhibits to be used during trial. THE COURT: Mr. Heal, did you receive a copy of that letter? Yes, we did. And I spoke with the counsel MR. HEAL: And this is, in all respects, what we agree to do. for ResCap. THE COURT: Okay. We'll proceed on that basis, then. What I would like you to do -- I guess -- I saw the letter; I forgot to bring it out. I did see the letter. And rather than having you do a separate order --MR. WISHNEW: Okay. THE COURT: -- we'll just endorse the letter. dates -- I'm so ordering that those dates are the applicable We'll proceed in that fashion. dates.

I'm in Worcester, Massachusetts.

Mr. Heal, where are you located?

MR. HEAL:

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So we'll try and make sure we find a date for an evidentiary hearing that works for you.

What I think we ought to do, counsel, is that after discovery is closed, the two of you ought to discuss how many witnesses you expect each side to call and how long a hearing do you estimate will be required.

MR. WISHNEW: Okay.

THE COURT: I didn't go back and look at the prior opinion, either the original opinion or on reconsideration before coming out. My sense is that the issues -- the factual issues are fairly narrow.

MR. WISHNEW: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And Mr. Heal, what I usually try to do when we have an evidentiary hearing, is unless somebody persuades me that credibility is at the heart of all of the issues, I usually want written direct testimony in the form of a declaration with the declarant in court for cross-examination. And so Mr. Wishnew can tell you, because he's familiar with how we've done some of these others, I would ask that when we get -- once you reach the close of fact discovery, see if the two of you can agree on submitting -- how many witnesses, submitting direct testimony in written narrative form by sworn declaration with the declarants in court. See if -- to the extent you can agree on exhibits, usually that

eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net

isn't so much of an issue. Usually you're able to stipulate as to authenticity and usually as to relevance. And see how -the extent to which you can streamline what evidentiary hearing is required.

And then you and Mr. Wishnew can talk about possible dates, when I have a better sense of how much time you think you'll need. We'll try to accommodate a schedule that'll work for both of you.

I don't permit any witness examination by telephone.
So whatever witnesses are called have to be present in court.
Okay?

MR. HEAL: It's Laird Heal. Thank you very much, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything else before we go on to the next matter, Mr. Wishnew, on this?

MR. WISHNEW: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thanks very much, Mr. Heal. You can be excused if you want; you can stay on if you wish.

MR. HEAL: This is Laird Heal. Thank you very much, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Go ahead, Mr. Wishnew.

MR. WISHNEW: Thank you, Your Honor. The next matter is on the bottom of page 8 continuing on to page 9, the ResCap Borrower Claims Trust's objection as to claim 725 filed by William J. Futrell. Like the last matter, this too is a status

11

I believe on the phone is Thomas Margolis, Mr. 1 conference. 2 Futrell's counsel. 3 MR. MARGOLIS: Correct. THE COURT: Okay, Mr. Margolis. 4 5 MR. WISHNEW: Your Honor --THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Wishnew. 6 7 -- similar to the prior matter -- well, MR. WISHNEW: 8 let me rephrase that. The parties have had discussions since 9 the Court issued its opinion sustaining in part and overruling in part the Borrowers Trust's objection to the claim filed by 10 11 William Futrell. And while Mr. Margolis has provided some damages calculations to us, we have a fundamental concern about 12 13 the causation or the nexus between the damages and the actual disputed QWRs that remain really the only open issue between 14 15 the parties at this point in time. 16 Long story short, Your Honor, we've not been able to consensually resolve the matter yet, so we'd like to move 17 18 forward towards an evidentiary hearing in that regards. 19 We did provide Mr. Margolis with a proposed form of 20 I'll run through that quickly, Your Honor. scheduling order. All fact discovery would be completed no later than October 21 Expert discovery, if needed, would be no later than 22 23 forty-five days after the close of factual discovery. 24 the -- let's see -- I'm just trying to think of appropriate 25 dates, Your Honor. That would really be it, Your Honor, in

	12
1	terms of hard dates. And then we'd follow Your Honor's
2	guidance in terms of scheduling an evidentiary hearing.
3	THE COURT: Right. Well, I'm also going to require a
4	pre-trial order
5	MR. WISHNEW: Yes.
6	THE COURT: joint pre-trial conference order using
7	the template.
8	Mr. Margolis, if you look at my at the Court's
9	Website under my chambers rules, you'll see the template that I
10	use for joint pre-trial conference orders. While this is not
11	an adversary proceeding, it's a contested matter, and I use
12	that same form for most contested matters as well. So you'll
13	see what's required by looking there.
14	MR. WISHNEW: Your Honor
15	MR. MARGOLIS: Okay.
16	MR. WISHNEW: I would just add for the record, that
17	the form of proposed case management and scheduling order we
18	did provide to Mr. Futrell was Your Honor's form order.
19	THE COURT: Yes, right.
20	MR. WISHNEW: So
21	THE COURT: And if you know, Mr. Margolis, the
22	template for case management and scheduling orders is also on
23	the Website, so
24	Mr. Margolis have you had a chance to consider I
25	take it Mr. Wishnew gave you these proposed dates before?

1	MR. MARGOLIS: I will tell you that I am learning as
2	we go. At this moment anyway, yeah, I'm learning as we go
3	with many of this.
4	THE COURT: I don't understand what you mean by that.
5	MR. MARGOLIS: Okay. Okay. It's a learning process
6	for me as far as what the Court has just indicated on any
7	template. And just and just moving this matter along.
8	THE COURT: Okay. We need to get this scheduled.
9	MR. WISHNEW: Yeah.
10	THE COURT: What I'm going to ask you to do, Mr.
11	Wishnew, is to speak with Mr. Margolis in the next couple of
12	days. Perhaps you could either e-mail him copies of the and
13	maybe you've already done this of the scheduling order
14	draft scheduling order you've done.
15	MR. WISHNEW: Yes, we did fax Mr. Margolis doesn't
16	have an e-mail address, so we've been communicating
17	THE COURT: Okay.
18	MR. WISHNEW: by facsimile.
19	THE COURT: Do you have e-mail, Mr. Margolis?
20	MR. MARGOLIS: I do.
21	MR. WISHNEW: Okay. So the two of you ought to speak.
22	I think it's a lot easier communicating by e-mails than with
23	fax machines. So speak you ought to speak today, if
24	possible, with Mr. Wishnew, give him your e-mail address, so
25	that you can communicate by e-mail. Maybe you can e-mail what

you've already faxed to him, Mr. Wishnew, with the proposed dates.

MR. WISHNEW: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I try to move these things along pretty quickly, Mr. Margolis. So see if the two of you can work out the schedule. If you can, submit it as a proposed order -- scheduling order to me. If you can't agree, let me know and we'll have another telephone conference. You won't have to come down, Mr. Wishnew. We're not going to wait for the next omnibus hearing date to do that.

MR. WISHNEW: Very good, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Does that work for you, Mr. Margolis?

MR. MARGOLIS: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. And just so you know, once fact discovery is closed -- and I'm not sure this is going to be a matter for expert discovery -- once discovery is closed, you'll get an evidentiary hearing pretty quickly. It won't be months, it'll be weeks. Okay? And the two of you ought to discuss how many -- you may have heard my prior conversation with Mr. Heal -- how many witnesses; what's your estimate of time. I usually require direct testimony in declaration form if it's of somebody who you can control, so that you can get a declaration, with the witness available in court for live cross-examination. And that's generally how we proceed to try and streamline the amount of time required for the evidentiary

1	hearings.
2	Okay, so the two of you, why don't you discuss it, see
3	if you can work out the schedule. If so, Mr. Wishnew, I'll
4	submit it and indicate that the two of you have agreed on a
5	schedule, and we'll go from there.
6	The last piece, as to the date for the hearing, I
7	won't give you right off the bat. We'll wait until you get
8	your discovery done, okay?
9	MR. WISHNEW: Very good, Your Honor.
10	MR. MARGOLIS: Okay.
11	THE COURT: All right, thanks very much. You're
12	excused if you wish to be. You can stay on the phone if you
13	want to.
14	MR. MARGOLIS: Thank you, Judge.
15	THE COURT: Okay.
16	MR. WISHNEW: Your Honor, the last status conference
17	today is dealing with the Borrower Claims Trust's objection to
18	proofs of claim 2769 and 2772 filed by Alvin and Sandra
19	LaBostrie. This was a matter previously adjourned. There was
20	a
21	THE COURT: All right. Are the LaBostries on the
22	phone? Anybody appearing for the LaBostries?
23	Go ahead.
24	MR. WISHNEW: Your Honor, this was put on as a status
25	conference because the response that the LaRostries submitted

in connection with the Borrowers Trust's claims objection 1 2 amounted to basically, we need more time; we're still looking for counsel. And this was docketed at 8999. 3 Your Honor, this is one of the -- this is a matter 4 5 where originally the Borrowers Trust filed the objection. 6 went uncontested. 7 THE COURT: I'm aware of that. 8 MR. WISHNEW: Okay. 9 THE COURT: I'm aware of this. So --10 MR. WISHNEW: We just wanted to move it to the next 11 available hearing, subject to --12 THE COURT: Well --13 MR. WISHNEW: -- as soon as --THE COURT: -- go ahead and remind me now. 14 15 make sure I'm not confusing it with another one. Sure, Your Honor. 16 MR. WISHNEW: 17 THE COURT: The history is? 18 The history is, Your Honor, we filed the MR. WISHNEW: 19 claims objection, served it. It was -- the matter was 20 The Court granted the objection. We subsequently uncontested. heard from Mr. LaBostrie saying he never got service of it. 21 22 While we believe our service was proper, we agreed to put it 23 back on the calendar --24 THE COURT: Right.

MR. WISHNEW: -- and allow him to respond. He then

1	submitted the only response he submitted was docket 8999
2	where he said where doesn't address any of the substantive
3	allegations or contest any of the facts. He simply just says
4	we're still looking for counsel. And so out of fairness,
5	rather than move forward on a substantive basis today, we put
6	it on for a status conference and are looking for guidance from
7	Your Honor as to how quickly we can get this back on the
8	calendar so we can resolve this matter.
9	THE COURT: What are the omnibus hearing dates in
10	September or October?
11	MR. WISHNEW: I think the only one we have in
12	September, Your Honor, is September 3rd, which
13	THE COURT: That's too soon.
14	MR. WISHNEW: Yeah. So the
15	THE COURT: What
16	MR. WISHNEW: I think the first one in October is
17	the first or second week in October, Your Honor.
18	THE COURT: All right. Schedule this for the October
19	omnibus hearing date. Please provide notice directly to the
20	LaBostries now that the Court has set it for that date, and it
21	will not be adjourned.
22	MR. WISHNEW: Thank you, Your Honor.
23	THE COURT: And
24	MR. WISHNEW: I guess one other question, Your Honor,
25	is

THE COURT: And likewise, any response -- substantive response from the LaBostries, the deadline should be set two weeks before the hearing, and any reply one week before the hearing.

MR. WISHNEW: Understood, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay?

MR. WISHNEW: Yes, Your Honor. That brings us to the last matter on today's calendar, Your Honor, which is the claims objection. This is at agenda -- or under section 3 on page 10 of today's agenda. It's the ResCap Borrower Claims Trust eighty-eighth omnibus objection.

And Your Honor, through the eighty-eighth -- I'm sorry. The eighty-eighth objection was filed at docket number 8859 on July 8th. Through this objection, the Borrowers Trust seeks to expunge twenty proofs of claim that do not represent valid pre-petition claims against the debtors. The Borrowers Trust thoroughly examined the debtors' books and records in an effort to validate the accuracy of the allegation made in the responses and the claims at issue, and determined the books and records do not show any liability due and owing to the respondents.

Responses to the objections were due on August 7th.

The Borrowers Trust received three responses to the objection.

The Borrowers Trust is addressing two of those responses today,

claim number 960 filed by Michael Boyd -- his responses were

	19
1	docketed at 8974 and 8977; and claim 3503 filed by Mohammed
2	Ghods and Heidi Ghods, docket number 9000. The Borrowers
3	THE COURT: All right, let me ask, is anyone is Mr.
4	Boyd or anyone else appearing for Mr. Boyd?
5	MR. GHODS: Hello, Your oh, Mr. Boyd? I'm sorry.
6	THE COURT: Okay. And I'm sorry, the Ghods was the
7	other one?
8	MR. WISHNEW: Yes, Your Honor.
9	THE COURT: Is anyone appearing for the Ghods?
10	MR. GHODS: Yes. Good morning, Your Honor. Mohammed
11	Ghods for the Ghods' claim.
12	THE COURT: Okay, I'm sorry, if I mispronounced your
13	name.
14	MR. GHODS: No problem, at all.
15	THE COURT: Let's so those are the only two that
16	are contested?
17	MR. WISHNEW: Those are the only two, Your Honor.
18	THE COURT: Let's deal with Boyd first. So go ahead.
19	MR. WISHNEW: Sure.
20	THE COURT: First, Mr. Wishnew, I'll hear from you.
21	And then I'll hear from Mr. Boyd.
22	MR. WISHNEW: Thank you, Your Honor. Your Honor, with
23	regards to Mr. Boyd, this is a claim that derives from pre-
24	petition litigation. And the matter has gone fully through the
25	appeals process. There were

This is the one where the -- you 1 THE COURT: Yes. 2 twice before objected to the claim on res judicata grounds. 3 MR. WISHNEW: That's correct, Your Honor. THE COURT: The first time the motion was denied 4 5 without prejudice, because Mr. Boyd had filed a petition for 6 rehearing in the Ninth Circuit, and under applicable Ninth --7 under applicable California law -- because they're state court 8 claims --9 State court claims. MR. WISHNEW: THE COURT: -- state law claims, the California rule 10 11 in res judicata is that it must be a final judgment, and no 12 appeals --13 MR. WISHNEW: Correct, Your Honor. THE COURT: -- pending. And so I denied the first 14 15 one. 16 MR. WISHNEW: Right. 17 THE COURT: Then you made another motion -- another 18 objection. And I denied without prejudice that second time, 19 because Mr. Boyd had filed a petition for writ of certiorari 20 and it had not yet been acted on. And I believe in -- was it in March that the Supreme Court denied certiorari? 21 22 MR. WISHNEW: It was --23 THE COURT: Maybe that's the wrong date. MR. WISHNEW: -- May 26th, Your Honor. 24 25 THE COURT: I'm sorry, what's the date again?

1	MR. WISHNEW: He petition Mr. Boyd petitioned for
2	certiorari March 20th.
3	THE COURT: Yeah, and then
4	MR. WISHNEW: It was denied May 26th.
5	THE COURT: Okay. So May 26th the Supreme Court
6	denied cert. Okay. So in the prior April opinion which was
7	when the cert petition had been filed
8	MR. WISHNEW: Right.
9	THE COURT: I laid out what the law is on res
10	judicata. And your argument is that cert's denied, final
11	judgment, res judicata applies, and the claim should be
12	expunged on the basis of res judicata. Correct?
13	MR. WISHNEW: Exactly, Your Honor. Yes.
14	THE COURT: Mr. Boyd has also asked that the stay be
15	lifted?
16	MR. WISHNEW: So Mr. Boyd, I believe in late July of
17	this year, filed a complaint against the U.S. Treasury and GMAC
18	Mortgage, and in connection with that complaint, has sought
19	stay relief. Now, we advised him prior to today's hearing that
20	trying to pursue any action like that against GMAC Mortgage was
21	in direct violation of the plan injunction and confirmation
22	order, and asked for it to be dismissed.
23	I think and I'll let Mr. Boyd confirm he has
24	dismissed it as to GMAC Mortgage, so that might moot his stay
25	relief motion, but I'll let Mr. Boyd address that point.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

earlier.

THE COURT: Okay. Because it was my understanding that -- and he can correct me -- but my understanding was the complaint was dismissed against GMAC, but it was unclear to me whether by the stay relief motion, he was seeking to reinstate the claim against GMAC. But --MR. WISHNEW: Correct, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. Let me hear from Mr. Boyd. Ι think I have a pretty good idea. I remember -- I looked yesterday and went through the papers so --MR. WISHNEW: Sure. THE COURT: -- I'm quite aware of the background. Mr. Boyd? Mr. Boyd? It's your chance to respond. COURTCALL OPERATOR: Pardon me, Your Honor. This is this CourtCall operator. His line is still connected. THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Boyd, this is your chance. I've been informed that you're still connected to the hearing, you previously made your appearance. Do you wish to be heard now? I'm taking the matter under submission on the basis of the papers that have been filed, and I'll enter an appropriate decision or order. Thank you, Your Honor. So that brings MR. WISHNEW: us to the last matter, which is the claim of Mr. and Mrs. Ghods. I apologize for mispronouncing the claimants' name

Your Honor, this claim deals with -- essentially, Mr. Ghods has asserted that there was not a secured interest that GMAC Mortgage was protecting when it placed property insurance on the underlying property. In response to that point, in our reply, we have provided both the recorded deed of trust originally with Ditech, as well as the assignment of that deed of trust to -- from Ditech to GMAC Mortgage.

In addition, Mr. Ghods has asserted that given his sale of the property in 2004, that he wasn't responsible for maintaining insurance on the property, since he no longer owned it. However, he has put forth nothing through either case law or anything contrary to the terms of the deed of trust to suggest that either he has the ability to absolve himself of the responsibilities under the deed of trust or that GMAC Mortgage acted improperly in any way.

So it is our position that GMAC Mortgage's actions were proper and that there is no valid basis for a claim against GMAC Mortgage at this point in time.

THE COURT: All right, Mr. Ghods, do you want to be heard?

MR. GHODS: Thank you, Your Honor. The problem I have is that most of the arguments that are being made here are launched off the reply. And I got the reply just a couple days ago. And I did see that the deed of trust has been included in the supplemental declaration that was submitted. That deed of

trust has been missing in action for years. It's the first time I've seen it in as many years as I've dealt with this issue.

I would like to get an opportunity to brief this. I think there's a factual issue, because obviously the supplemental declaration is not by anyone who has personal knowledge of these things, and statements are made that I can tell the Court, since I'm also the claimant here, they're just outright false in terms of when the notice was given to GMAC and whether a package allegedly was sent. There was no such package sent.

So there is some factual disputes here. But I would like to get it resolved, because this is a snake that keeps on living that shouldn't be living. At some point, I guess, someone has to make a decision on it. It's absurd to have to procure insurance for a property that's not owned. And I think there is a "due on sale" clause law out there that deals with these issues when the lender decides, despite knowledge, to not call the collateral.

I am -- I've seen the deed of trust now, and that was missing, obviously. So that's not the argument that is going to be further beaten into the ground. They have produced a deed of trust. But as to the remainder, I think there is substantial factual issues and a different legal picture you have to look at. So I'm requesting an opportunity to file a

further brief and some additional comments for you to consider in light of their reply. And if you find there's a factual dispute, I guess we'll have to have something more. But if that's sufficient for you to make a ruling as a matter of law, then let's do so with the full picture.

THE COURT: What do you believe are the factual issues?

MR. GHODS: Well, in terms of when the lender or servicer was put on notice of the sale. What happened, Your Honor, is the title company here could not find any evidence of these deeds of trust. So it was presumed that it was an unsecured loan because of failure to record. This package that's been submitted to you with the reply is the first time the deed of trust has appeared.

so the reason that they weren't paid out of the escrow from the sale is because they did not appear on the record. We made the payments, my wife and I, because we believed it was an unsecured loan, so that nobody has reneged on payments.

So the issue became this placement of forced insurance on the property. And we advised the lender that it was -- the property had been sold, and they didn't have a -- we didn't have an ability to insure it and they didn't have an ability, or they could call it, and they decided not to call it, apparently. And they've continued to charge his force placed insurance.

	26
1	So I want to address those issues a little bit more in
2	light of the supplemental declaration that's been filed in
3	reply. Thank you, Your Honor.
4	THE COURT: Mr. Wishnew?
5	MR. WISHNEW: Your Honor, it seems a bit strange to me
6	that
7	THE COURT: Was the deed of trust recorded?
8	MR. WISHNEW: Yes, Your Honor.
9	THE COURT: When was it recorded?
10	MR. WISHNEW: The deed of trust was recorded in 1998.
11	And the assignment of deed of trust from Ditech to GMAC
12	Mortgage, was recorded in 1999. So they could have gone to the
13	public records and
14	THE COURT: Yeah, I don't know who searched for it,
15	Mr. Ghods, but there if you had somebody search for it and
16	they didn't find it, that's not their problem.
17	MR. WISHNEW: Also
18	MR. GHODS: No, I realize that, Your Honor. I
19	personally wasn't the it wasn't my search. I searched
20	subsequently and I couldn't find it. It was the title company.
21	And I forget who it was. It was if it wasn't First
22	American, it was one of the big ones. And they could not find
23	any evidence for whatever reason. I have I could not
24	explain that to you.
25	But then the conversation and as I said, I'm

getting past that point, because they have what -- they have produced what appears to be a recorded document. And so I'm not interested in trying to quibble with something that seems to be, at least, you know, proper on its face.

But what I have an issue is the notice to the lender and the issue of what they were going to do once they were aware of the sale. Because at that point, our position -- my wife and I -- was that we were making the payments, and but there was no need for insurance. And I think this is where the dispute is.

THE COURT: But Mr. Ghods --

MR. GHODS: Their position was --

THE COURT: -- Mr. Ghods --

MR. GHODS: -- there is --

THE COURT: -- the law is pretty clear that if that deed of trust is recorded and remains of record, it's valid and enforceable. Whether somebody called it or not called it, their rights are not waived by -- it's pretty unusual that somebody would sell the property without -- that a buyer would want to be -- would get clear title and want a lien release. But assuming -- and there also are provisions about giving the lender notice of sale. But you don't seem to be disputing now that there was a valid recorded deed of trust still in place.

You continued to make payments. I don't think you did it out of the goodness of your heart. I don't know what the

1	terms of your sale were.
2	MR. GHODS: Well
3	THE COURT: But here's what I'm going to do. You're
4	correct that it was presented with a supplemental declaration
5	with the reply, and you've not had an opportunity to respond to
6	that. I'm going to give you two weeks from today to file any
7	further response. And I'll give the Trust one week from the
8	time you receive Mr. Ghods' supplemental filing for any
9	additional filing. At that point, the matter will be taken
10	under submission without further hearing, unless I specifically
11	call for it.
12	MR. GHODS: Yes. If I now that I have your ear,
13	may I have it for one more second?
14	THE COURT: Sure.
15	MR. GHODS: In light of your last comments, Your
16	Honor?
17	THE COURT: Yes, go ahead.
18	MR. GHODS: The payments were not made out of the
19	goodness of my heart. It was made out of what I believed was a
20	clear obligation under the note to make those payments. And we
21	have dutifully paid them.
22	The dispute here is and I think it's strange that
23	counsel said and I think Your Honor mentioned that what has
24	happened here is the title company gave the green light for the
25	sale and there's been several subsequent sales. So the issues

that have come up -- I'll address them in the brief -- but I think it is unique and it does require a little bit of careful attention, because the lender here, with a deed of trust, presumably, if they were going to take action today, they're going to have to take a foreclosure action, if there was a breach of the note. Assume that for a second. They're --

THE COURT: The only issue --

MR. GHODS: -- going to have to --

THE COURT: -- Mr. Ghods?

MR. GHODS: I beg your pardon.

THE COURT: The only issue before me is whether you have a valid claim. Whether title to the property is clouded in some fashion is not my problem. What I have is a claim that you have filed against the estate and the Trust's objection to the claim. There appears to be -- I'm not deciding it now -- there appears to be a contractual obligation in the mortgage that there be insurance and gives them the right to place insurance if you don't provide the evidence of insurance.

They indicated that that's the basis for their placing the insurance. I'm going to give you the two weeks to file any further papers. Mr. Wishnew will have one week from the time that you submit your supplemental response. And then the matter will be taken under submission unless the Court decides that another hearing is required, in which case we'll give you notice of it. Okay?

1	MR. GHODS: Yeah, thank you very much, Your Honor.
2	Appreciate it.
3	THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much.
4	MR. GHODS: Okay.
5	MR. WISHNEW: Your Honor, that addresses the two
6	contested matters. There was a third response we received that
7	was resolved consensually. So based on the record before the
8	Court and the submissions, we'd ask that the balance of the
9	omnibus claims objection be granted.
10	THE COURT: And it is.
11	MR. WISHNEW: Thank you, Your Honor.
12	THE COURT: So the Court has reviewed the eighty-
13	eighth omnibus objection to borrower claims. It appears as ECF
14	docket number 8859. By the objection, the Trust seeks to
15	disallow and expunge twenty claims on the basis that the claims
16	are not based on liabilities of the debtors, and reduced two
17	claims and allow each claim in a modified reduced amount.
18	The oppositions to the objection were filed by Mr.
19	Boyd, who we've heard from; from Mohammed and Heidi Ghods, who
20	we've heard from; Kechia Island
21	MR. WISHNEW: That was the claim resolved
22	consensually, Your Honor.
23	THE COURT: All right. So Island has been resolved.
24	As to the remainder of the claims, the Court has reviewed the
25	objection. The objection is well taken. The objection is

	31
1	sustained. And obviously I'm not resolving today the Boyd
2	claim is under submission, the Court is going to enter a
3	decision or order with respect to Boyd. And as to the Ghods,
4	I've set forth the additional opportunity for the Ghods and the
5	Trust to submit supplemental filings.
6	MR. WISHNEW: Would Your Honor prefer or like that we
7	incorporate those submission deadlines into the form of order
8	for the eighty-eighth
9	THE COURT: No, I think we're clear
10	MR. WISHNEW: Okay.
11	THE COURT: on that. So the form of the order
12	should deal with everything other than the Ghods and Boyd.
13	MR. WISHNEW: Yeah.
14	THE COURT: Okay?
15	MR. WISHNEW: Yeah, very well, Your Honor.
16	THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much, Mr.
17	Wishnew.
18	MR. WISHNEW: Thank you for your time.
19	THE COURT: All right, we're adjourned.
20	(Whereupon these proceedings were concluded at 10:37 AM)
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

			32
1			
2	INDEX		
3			
4	RULINGS		
5	PAGE	LINE	
6	Letter scheduling order re Gosselin claim is 8	22	
7	approved by the Court.		
8	Trust's eighty-eighth objection to claims is 30	25	
9	sustained as to the uncontested and resolved		
10	claims.		
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

CERTIFICATION  I, Penina Wolicki, certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.  Penina Wolicki  Penina Wolicki  AAERT Certified Electronic Transcriber CET**D-569  eScribers  700 West 192nd Street, Suite #607  New York, NY 10040  Date: August 21, 2015			33
I, Penina Wolicki, certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.  Penina Wolicki  Penina Wolicki  AAERT Certified Electronic Transcriber CET**D-569  escribers  700 West 192nd Street, Suite #607  New York, NY 10040  Date: August 21, 2015  Date: August 21, 2015	1		
I, Penina Wolicki, certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.  Penina Wolicki  Penina Wolicki  AAERT Certified Electronic Transcriber CET**D-569  eScribers  700 West 192nd Street, Suite #607  New York, NY 10040  Date: August 21, 2015	2	CERTIFICATION	
true and accurate record of the proceedings.  True and accurate record of the proceedings.	3		
PENINA WOLICKI  AAERT Certified Electronic Transcriber CET**D-569  escribers  700 West 192nd Street, Suite #607  New York, NY 10040  Date: August 21, 2015  Date: August 21, 2015	4	I, Penina Wolicki, certify that the foregoing transcript is a	
PENINA WOLICKI  AAERT Certified Electronic Transcriber CET**D-569  escribers  700 West 192nd Street, Suite #607  New York, NY 10040  Date: August 21, 2015  Date: August 21, 2015	5	true and accurate record of the proceedings.	
PENINA WOLICKI  AAERT Certified Electronic Transcriber CET**D-569  eScribers  700 West 192nd Street, Suite #607  New York, NY 10040  Date: August 21, 2015  Date: August 21, 2015	6		
PENINA WOLICKI  AAERT Certified Electronic Transcriber CET**D-569  escribers  700 West 192nd Street, Suite #607  New York, NY 10040  Date: August 21, 2015  Date: August 21, 2015	7		
penina Wolicki  AAERT Certified Electronic Transcriber CET**D-569  escribers  700 West 192nd Street, Suite #607  New York, NY 10040  Date: August 21, 2015  Date: August 21, 2015	8		
PENINA WOLICKI  AAERT Certified Electronic Transcriber CET**D-569  eScribers  700 West 192nd Street, Suite #607  New York, NY 10040  Date: August 21, 2015  Date: August 21, 2015	9	Penina Waliety.	
PENINA WOLICKI  AAERT Certified Electronic Transcriber CET**D-569  eScribers  700 West 192nd Street, Suite #607  New York, NY 10040  Date: August 21, 2015  Date: August 21, 2015			
AAERT Certified Electronic Transcriber CET**D-569  eScribers 700 West 192nd Street, Suite #607  New York, NY 10040  Date: August 21, 2015  Date: August 21, 2015		PENINA WOLICKI	
escribers 700 West 192nd Street, Suite #607 New York, NY 10040  Date: August 21, 2015  Date: August 21, 2015		AAERT Certified Electronic Transcriber CET**D-569	
eScribers 700 West 192nd Street, Suite #607 New York, NY 10040  Date: August 21, 2015  Date: August 21, 2015			
700 West 192nd Street, Suite #607  New York, NY 10040  Date: August 21, 2015  Date: August 21, 2015  20  21  22  23  24		eScribers	
New York, NY 10040  Date: August 21, 2015  Date: August 21, 2015  20  21  22  23  24		700 West 192nd Street, Suite #607	
Date: August 21, 2015  Date: August 21, 2015  20  21  22  23  24		New York, NY 10040	
19 20 21 22 23 24			
21 22 23 24	19	Date: August 21, 2015	
22 23 24	20		
23 24	21		
24	22		
	23		
25	24		
	25		